Case 1:03-md-01570-GBD-SN Document 3394 Filed 11/16/16 Page 1 of 2

Case 1:03-md-01570-GBD-SN Document 3389-3 Filed 1/1/03/16 Page 2 of

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COUNTS
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001

03 MDL 1570 (GBI) (FM)

ECF Case

This document relates to:

Ashton et al. v. al Qaeda Islamic Army, et al., 02-CV-6977 (GBD)(FM)

## [PROPOSED] FINAL ORDER OF SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Upon consideration of the evidence and arguments submitted by claimants in the Estate of David L. Angell wrongful death claim, part of the above-captioned action, and the Judgment by Default Against the Islamic Republic of Iran entered on 08/26/2015, together with the entire record in this case, and in addition to the default judgment award for compensatory damages for the pre-death conscious pain and suffering of each decedent (*see* ECF Nos. 3226, 3229) and the final order of summary judgment for certain other *Ashton* plaintiffs (*see* ECF Nos. 3300, 3387) it is hereby;

ORDERED that final judgment is entered on behalf of those parties in Ashton et al. v. Al Qaeda Islamic Army et al., 02-CV-6977 (GBD) (FM) identified in the attached Exhibit A against the Islamic Republic of Iran; and it is

ORDERED that the *Ashton* claimants identified in the attached Exhibit A are awarded solutium damages as set forth in Exhibit A with prejudgment interest awarded on those claims arising out of injuries in New York State to be calculated at the rate of 4.96% per annum from September 11, 2001 until today; all interest compounded annually over the same period; and it is

Case 1:03-md-01570-GBD-SN Document 3389-3 Filed 11/03/16 Page 3 of 3

**ORDERED** that the Ashton claimants identified in the attached Exhibit A are awarded economic damages as set forth in Exhibit A and as supported by the expert report and analysis submitted as Exhibit B; and it is

**ORDERED** that the Ashton claimants not appearing on Exhibit A may submit in later stages applications for solatium and economic damages awards that will be approved on the same basis as currently approved for those parties appearing on Exhibit A.

Dated: New York, New York

SO ORDERED:

TATES DISTRICT JUDGE